

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 7, 2005 has been reviewed and carefully considered.

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 9 and 10 have been amended. Claims 14-21 have been cancelled without prejudice.

The Applicant's gratefully acknowledge the indication in the Office Action that Claims 10-13 are allowable if rewritten in independent form with all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-5, 8, 9, and 14-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (hereinafter "Smith") in view of Gerszberg et al. (hereinafter "Gerszberg"). Claims 6, 7, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (hereinafter "Smith") as modified by Gerszberg as applied to Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 14-19 above, and further in view of Desmond et al. (hereinafter "Desmond").

Claims 1-5, 8, 9, and 14-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Braun et al. (hereinafter "Braun") in view of Gerszberg. Claims 6, 7, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Braun as modified by Gerszberg as applied to Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 14-19 above, and further in view of Desmond. Claims 1-5, 8, 9, and 14-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlachman et al. (hereinafter "Schlachman") in view of Gerszberg. Claims 6, 7, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlachman as modified by Gerszberg as applied to Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 14-19 above, and further in view of Desmond.

Claims 1-5, 8-9 and 14-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,603,839 to Smith, Jr. et al. (hereinafter Smith) in view of Gerszberg. Claims 6, 7, 20, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith as modified by Gerszberg as applied to Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 14-19 above, and further in view of Desmond. Claims 1-5, 8-9 and 14-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Braun in view of Gerszberg. Claims 6-7 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Braun as modified by Gerszberg as applied to claims 1-5, 8-9, 14-19 above, and further in view of Desmond. Claims 1-5, 8, 9, and 14-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlachman in view of Gerszberg. Claims 6-7 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlachman as modified by Gerszberg as applied to claims 1-5, 8-9, 14-19 above and further in view of Desmond.

The rejections are respectfully traversed. While Applicant maintains that neither Braun, Gerszberg, Desmond, Schlachman and/or Smith, either individually or in any combination, disclose or suggest the features of claims 1-21, and that Gerszberg is non-analogous art and therefore cannot be combined with any of Smith, Braun and/or Schlachman, Applicant has herewith presented allowable claim 10 in independent form to include the features of claim 1, from which it depends.

In addition, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the features of allowable claim 10, namely, to recite *inter alia*, "said device for displaying being remote over the DSL network from a voicemail server located within the DSL network, the voicemail server including an answering device coupled to the DSL network for storing messages of the device for displaying; and means for the user selecting an entry from a message listing to

retrieve a message stored on the voice mail server, the messages being textually rendered and provided to the device for displaying."

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 10 are believed to be patentable and nonobvious over Braun, Gerszberg, Desmond, Schlachman and/or Smith for at least the reasons stated above. Claims 2-9 and 11-13 depend either directly or indirectly from and include all the limitations of claims 1 and 10, respectively. Accordingly, Claims 2-9 and 11-13 are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited references for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claims 1 and 10, respectively.

Claims 14-21 have been cancelled without prejudice.


Reconsideration of the rejections are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the claims set forth in the Office Action of January 7, 2005 be withdrawn, that pending claims 1-13 be allowed, and that the case proceed to early issuance of Letters Patent in due course.

Any additional fees or charges as required at this time in connection with the application, may be charged to applicant's Deposit Account No. 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Virag et al.

Dated: 12 April 2005

By: 
Joseph J. Konecka, Attorney
Registration No.: 39,731
(609) 734-6816

Mailing Address:
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543